REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 9, 12, and 15 have been amended and claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-19 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment, of which claims 1, 9, and 12 are independent claims. The amendments have support throughout the original specification and no new matter has been introduced. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, and 11-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0075794 to Park ("Park") and claims 8, 10, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park. To the extent these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 relates to a data storage disk that comprises, among other things, a data storage portion between an outer edge and an intermediate boundary, a non-recording portion between the intermediate boundary and an inner edge, at least one slot disposed between the intermediate boundary and the inner edge, and wherein a distance between an inner sidewall of the slot and the center of the data storage disk is larger than the radius of the inner edge. Amended claim 9 recites that a distance between an inner sidewall of the slot and the center of the data storage disk is larger than the radius of the

inner edge, and a distance between an outer sidewall of the slot and the center of the data storage disk is smaller than the radius of the intermediate boundary. The above feature of amended claim 9 is also included in amended claim 12.

Park discloses a disk-type recording medium having a crack hindering element. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Park shows a data storage disk 10 including a slot 11 for hindering an extension to a crack. However, element 11 in Park is a non-recording surface portion. Referring to paragraph [0029] of Park, "the non-recording surface portion 11 is an annular part formed from the center hole 10a to the information recording surface portion 13 of a predetermined length." Further, the mechanism used to hinder the crack in Park is a protrusion portion 15 rather than a slot. Referring to paragraph [0031] of Park, "when the crack advances from the center hole 10a to the outer side of the disk-type recording medium, the advancement of the crack is primarily blocked or slowed down by a first protrusion 15a, and the crack is once more blocked or slowed down by a second protrusion portion 15b." Also mentioned in paragraph [0011] of Park, "[T]he crack hindering element includes at least one annular protrusion portion around the center hole."

In the present application, claim 1 recites a data storage disk including at least one slot disposed between the intermediate boundary and the inner edge. Further, a distance between an inner sidewall of the slot and the center of the data storage disk is larger than the radius of the inner edge. The slot not only hinders an extension to a crack occurred, but also reduces the manufacture cost of the disk. Contrarily, Park uses at least one protrusion to hinder the crack, which is different from the present invention and increases the manufacture cost of the disk.

The Examiner also mentions a hindered crack illustrated in FIG. 1A and 1B in Park. Referring to FIG. 1A in Park, a crack C is hindered by the inner edge defined by the center hole 1a. It should be understood that the inner edge in FIG. 1B in Park is unable to hinder the crack toward the outer edge of the disk. FIGs. 1A and 1B in Park also fail to show at least one slot between the intermediate boundary and the inner edge of the disk and also fail to show a distance between an inner sidewall of the slot and the center of the data storage disk that is larger than the radius of the inner edge.

Based on the above discussion, Park fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least one slot disposed between the outer edge and the inner edge, as recited in amended claim 1, at least one slot disposed in the non-recording portion, as recited by amended clam 9, and at least one slot disposed between the data storage portion and the inner edge, as recited in amended claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1, 9, and 12 are not anticipated by Park and should be patentable.

In addition, at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-7, 11 and 13-17 should be also patentable.

Similarly, based on the above discussion, because that claims 8, 10, 18 and 19 respectively depend directly or indirectly on allowable claims 1, 9, 12, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 10, 18, and 19 should also be patentable over Park.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-770-7606

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2005

By: _____
Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

MB/LDE/CYM/dkp

Customer No. 00909